

Q: WHAT ABOUT THE --

A: THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT'S POSITION IS CLEAR. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES SHOULD BE REWARDED. SUCH BEHAVIOR, IN OUR VIEW, SERVES ONLY TO ENCOURAGE MORE TERRORISM AND PROLONG THE ORDEAL OF OTHER HOSTAGES, INCLUDING THE NINE INNOCENT AMERICANS.

Q: AND THE STATEMENT THAT THIS CLEARS THE WAY FOR NORMALIZATION OF RELATIONS, DOES THAT GIVE THE STATE DEPARTMENT ANY CLUE AS TO WHAT MIGHT HAVE INDUCED THE IRANIANS TO LET THEM GO?

A: I THINK I'VE ADDRESSED THE QUESTION AS BEST I CAN.

Q: LET ME JUST ASK YOU THEN, "BY REWARD," CAN YOU BE A LITTLE MORE SPECIFIC? I MEAN, NONE OF US, I SUPPOSE, IS TAKING ABOUT RANSOM.

IF THE FRENCH CHANGED THEIR POLICY, WOULD YOU CONSIDER THAT SOMETHING YOU DON'T THINK OUGHT TO BE THROWN INTO A HOSTAGE DEAL?

A: I'M NOT PREPARED TO OFFER ANY FURTHER SPECIFIC ANALYSIS BEYOND THE GENERAL APPRECIATION THAT I'VE GIVEN YOU IN THE CONTEXT OF THESE WORDS.

Q: DO YOU HAVE ANY REACTION TO PEGGY SAY'S CRITICISM OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT, COMPARED WITH FRANCE?

A: I WOULD REJECT THE NOTION THAT OUR GOVERNMENT IS ANY LESS CONCERNED THAN ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT. PRESIDENT REAGAN REFLECTED THE FEELINGS OF THE ENTIRE ADMINISTRATION WHEN HE SAID HE SHARED THE FRUSTRATION OF THE HOSTAGES' FAMILIES. THEY, TOO, ARE THE VICTIMS OF TERRORISM.

WE ARE DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE HOSTAGES, AND ARE DOING WHAT WE CAN TO OBTAIN THEIR RELEASE. AS WE HAVE SAID OVER AND OVER AGAIN, THE UNITED STATES IS WILLING TO TALK TO ANYBODY AT ANY TIME ABOUT THE RELEASE OF THE HOSTAGES, BUT THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT WILL NOT TAKE ACTIONS SUCH AS CHANGING OUR POLICIES WHICH WOULD ENCOURAGE MORE HOSTAGE-TAKING.

Q: HAVE YOU GOTTEN FROM THE FRENCH ANY USEFUL INFORMATION ABOUT THE AMERICAN HOSTAGES?

A: I CAN ONLY SAY AT THIS STAGE THAT WE'RE OBVIOUSLY INTERESTED IN LEARNING ABOUT THE WELFARE OF THE AMERICAN HOSTAGES, AS WELL AS ANY OTHER INFORMATION THAT THE RELEASED HOSTAGES MAY BE ABLE TO PROVIDE. WE'RE IN TOUCH WITH THE FRENCH ABOUT THIS.

Q: CHUCK, HAS THE UNITED STATES INFORMED THE AFGHAN RESISTANCE OF THE CONDITIONS WHICH THEY WOULD HAVE TO MAKE, MEET, TO BE GIVEN RECOGNITION AS A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT? AND IF SO, WHETHER THE CONDITIONS AS OUTLINED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES ARE CORRECT ONES?

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/04

A: LET ME REVIEW JUST A FEW POINTS IN GETTING TO YOUR QUESTION. THE FIRST AND ESSENTIAL STEP IN AFGHANISTAN IS SOVIET WITHDRAWAL. THAT REMAINS THE CASE. SOVIET WITHDRAWAL WILL CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT MORE CONDUCTIVE TO A GENUINE PROCESS OF SELF-DETERMINATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A MORE BROADLY-BASED GOVERNMENT.

BT  
#7118

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/04

THE UNITED STATES POSITION HAS BEEN, AND CONTINUES TO BE, ONE OF FULL SUPPORT FOR AFGHAN SELF-DETERMINATION. THE UNITED STATES, HOWEVER, IS NOT INVOLVED IN ANY EFFORTS TO FORM A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT WITH THE RESISTANCE OR ANYONE ELSE. WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY STATED THAT WE WOULD SUPPORT A BROADLY-BASED GOVERNMENT, BUT FORMING SUCH A GOVERNMENT IS SOMETHING THAT HAS TO BE DONE BY THE AFGHAN PEOPLE, INCLUDING THE RESISTANCE.

AT THIS STAGE, IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO TALK ABOUT QUESTIONS OF WHEN OR UNDER EXACTLY WHAT CONDITIONS THAT WE WOULD BE PREPARED TO ESTABLISH RELATIONS WITH ANY GOVERNMENT IN AFGHANISTAN, BUT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT CRITERIA FOR ANY GOVERNMENT TO HAVE INTERNATIONAL ACCEPTABILITY. THESE INCLUDE THAT A GOVERNMENT CONTROLS TERRITORY, HAS AN EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT STRUCTURE, POSSESSES THE CAPACITY TO EXERCISE THE VALID INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE STATE, AND ENJOYS BROAD SUPPORT. AND CONCERNING THOSE KINDS OF CRITERIA, THE RESISTANCE IS WELL AWARE OF OUR VIEWS.

Q: THAT IS THE CRITERIA? YOU KNOW, WE HAVEN'T HEARD THAT IN A FEW YEARS. AND DOES IT HAVE APPLICATION TO PANAMA? CONTROL OF THE TERRITORY IS

A: I'M JUST STATING A NUMBER OF GENERAL CRITERIA.

Q: DO YOU HAVE ANY SPECIFIC, OR IS THAT YOUR GENERAL ANSWER --

A: (INAUDIBLE)

Q: NO. -- TO NAJIBULLAH'S OFFER NOW TO SHARE POWER, AS HE IS REPORTED TO HAVE TOLD INDIAN AUTHORITIES? OR MUST HE GO?

A: CIVICALLY, THE NAJIBULLAH REGIME HAS BEEN DISCREDITED, AND AS WE HAVE OFTEN SAID, SIMPLY DOESN'T REPRESENT THE AFGHAN PEOPLE. THE IMPORTANT POINT IS THAT THE AFGHAN PEOPLE THEMSELVES WOULD DECIDE ON AFGHANISTAN'S POLITICAL SYSTEM AND THEIR POLITICAL LEADERS.

IT'S CLEAR THAT THE PDPA, NAJIBULLAH'S PARTY, LACKS POPULAR SUPPORT AMONG THE AFGHAN PEOPLE. HE HAS MADE THESE PROPOSITIONS OF INTEREST IN POWER SHARING BEFORE. HIS FORMULATIONS HAVE ALWAYS LACKED CREDIBILITY, AND THEY STILL DO. THEY'VE NEVER ADDRESSED THE ISSUE OF GENUINE POWER SHARING, BUT RATHER AMOUNT TO PDPA DOMINATION OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Q: ON THE AFGHAN, BEFORE WE LEAVE THAT, IT IS REPORTED FOLLOWING FROM WHAT THE GENERAL CRITERIA THAT YOU'VE DESCRIBED, IF (?) THE UNITED STATES HAS TOLD THE AFGHAN GUERRILLAS, WE WOULD SUPPORT THEM IN AN EFFORT TO FORM A PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT IF THEY CONSOLIDATE THEIR CONTROL OF MOST OF THE COUNTRY, THEY MEET OTHER CRITERIA. IS THAT CORRECT?

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/05

A: I THINK I'VE ANSWERED THE QUESTION AS BEST I CAN IN  
TERMS OF HOW ONE WOULD LOOK ON ANY OTHER GOVERNMENT THAT  
MIGHT BE FORMED IN AFGHANISTAN. BUT I WOULD GO BACK TO  
THE BASIC POINT, WHICH IS THAT THOSE KIND OF QUESTIONS,  
WHILE THINGS THAT COULD BE DISCUSSED, ARE STILL PREMATURE  
AT THIS STAGE. THE BASIC POINT THAT I WOULD LIKE TO  
UNDERLINE IS THE ONE THAT I JUST STATED, WHICH IS THAT

BT

#7118

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/05

IT'S FOR THE AFGHAN PEOPLE TO DECIDE WHAT KIND OF GOVERNMENT THEY ARE GOING TO HAVE, HOW THAT GOVERNMENT IS GOING TO BE FORMED. THAT HAS BEEN THE POSITION THAT WE HAVE CONSISTENTLY SUPPORTED, THAT THE UNITED NATIONS HAS SUPPORTED THROUGHOUT THE LONG YEARS OF THIS WAR.

Q: WELL, YOU HAVE MADE A GENERALIZATION BEFORE ABOUT ONE OF THE CRITERIA IS THE CONTROL OF TERRITORY. YOU DIDN'T SAY HOW MUCH TERRITORY, OR ANY OTHER SORT, BUT THIS STORY SUGGESTS THAT THEY SHOULD CONSOLIDATE, IS THE WORD, THE CONTROL OF MOST OF THEIR TERRITORY. AND I GUESS MY QUESTION IS, IS THAT A CRITERION WHICH HAS IN SOME WAY BEEN ADVANCED BY A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE US GOVERNMENT TO THE AFGHAN RESISTANCE?

A: I THINK I COVERED THAT IN TALKING ABOUT THE GENERAL CRITERIA THAT MIGHT BE APPLIED, AND I SAID THE RESISTANCE WAS WELL AWARE OF THAT.

Q: NO, YOU DIDN'T COVER THE AT LEAST TO MY UNDERSTANDING -- THE QUESTION OF THE DEGREE. YOU COVERED THE FACT THAT TERRITORY WAS ONE OF THE --

A: NO, I'M NOT GOING INTO ANY SPECIFIC DETAILS AS TO THE CRITERIA. THERE I'D RELY ON WHAT I JUST SAID TO EXPLAIN WHY I AM NOT GOING TO GO FURTHER ON THOSE KINDS OF SPECIFICS.

Q: O.K., ON THE SAME SUBJECT? IS THE UNITED STATES PREPARED TO HELP THESE FOLKS CONSOLIDATE? THEY HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO DO IT WITH US HELP. I KNOW YOUR RULE ON US AID -- WE'LL WATCH SOVIETS AND PROVIDE COMMENSURATE AID. BUT IS THE US, IN ANY WAY WITH MILITARY EQUIPMENT OR OTHERWISE, GOING TO HELP THESE FOLKS CONSOLIDATE OR TRY TO CONSOLIDATE WHAT THEY CONTROL?

A: I'M NOT SURE EXACTLY WHAT YOUR QUESTION IMPLIES BY TALKING CONSOLIDATION WITH MILITARY EQUIPMENT, WITH FORMATION OF FUTURE GOVERNMENTS --

Q: WELL, BASICALLY YOU'RE SAYING IT IS UP TO THE AFGHAN PEOPLE TO DECIDE THEIR FUTURE, WHICH IS INDEED AN AMERICAN PRINCIPLE, BUT IN THE MEANTIME YOU SORT OF TRY TO HELP ONE SIDE DETERMINE ITS FUTURE, THE FUTURE OF THE COUNTRY, AND I WONDERED IF THE US WOULD ASSIST THE FORCES, THE REBELS, THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS, AS YOU CALL THEM, ACHIEVE THIS GOAL THAT YOU'D LIKE TO SEE THEM ACHIEVE.

A: LET ME ANSWER IT AS BEST I CAN UNDERSTAND IT.

Q: ALL RIGHT.

A: FIRST, ON THE QUESTION OF ASSISTANCE, THERE OUR POSITION IS VERY CLEARLY ON THE RECORD. SECRETARY SHULTZ PUT IT FORWARD A NUMBER OF TIMES, AT THE TIME WE SIGNED THE GENEVA ACCORDS A FEW WEEKS AGO, SO THAT IS THERE AND THERE HAS BEEN ABSOLUTELY NO CHANGE IN THAT.

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/06

ON THE QUESTION OF ASSISTANCE IN TERMS OF WORKING TOWARD THE FUTURE OF AFGHANISTAN, WE HAVE ALSO SAID THAT WE HAVE WELCOMED MR. CORDOVEZ'S AGREEMENT TO WORK ON AN INTRAAFGHAN DIALOGUE. THE OBJECTIVE OF THAT IS TO BRING ABOUT A NEW GOVERNMENT TO REPLACE THE DISCREDITED NAJIFULLAH REGIME, AND WE WOULD CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THAT KIND OF ASSISTANCE.

ET  
#7118

NNNN

UNCLASSIFIED

STATE 147118/06

Q: CHUCK, WHAT'S THE STATUS OF THE REFUGEE RETURN PROCESS? SECRETARY SHULTZ REFERRED TO IT IN HIS TALK, AND HE SAID THAT THERE MIGHT BE A PROBLEM IN GETTING US FUNDS FOR THAT EFFORT. DO YOU HAVE A STATUS REPORT ON WHAT'S BEING DONE?

A: I DON'T HAVE ANY PARTICULAR STATUS REPORT. THERE IS A LOT OF WORK BEING DONE ON THAT. WE HAVE ESTABLISHED A GROUP OF PEOPLE HERE WHO ARE EXPERT ON THESE KINDS OF THINGS TO WORK WITH THE UNITED NATIONS AND WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ON THESE KINDS OF ISSUES.

I THINK IT WOULD BE FAIR TO SAY THAT AT THIS STAGE, PEOPLE ARE STILL WORKING THROUGH THE ISSUE TRYING TO DEFINE IT MORE PRECISELY, TRYING TO DETERMINE WHAT KINDS OF RESOURCES ARE GOING TO BE REQUIRED.

~~C: WHAT HAS BECOME OF SECRETARY SHULTZ'S MIDDLE EAST PEACE INITIATIVE? WHAT'S BECOME OF IT?~~

~~A: WHAT'S BECOME OF IT? THERE ARE A LOT OF PEOPLE STILL WORKING ON IT. WE STILL HAVE AMBASSADOR CLUVERIUS IN THE REGION WHO CONTINUES TO VISIT ALL THE MAJOR PARTIES. OUR EMBASSIES ARE IN TOUCH WITH LEADERSHIP IN THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES. I SEE REPORTING TELEGRAMS EVERY DAY IN WHICH THESE KINDS OF QUESTIONS ARE BEING DISCUSSED. SO, WE ARE STILL WORKING ON IT, AND THE SECRETARY KEEPS A CLOSE EYE ON DEVELOPMENTS, AS HE DECIDES WHAT THE NEXT APPROPRIATE STEP MIGHT BE.~~

Q: WHY IS IT THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT WON'T CONSIDER SENDING A PERMANENT SPECIAL ENVOY OUT THERE TO DEAL WITH IT?

A: THAT SIMPLY IS NOT THE ANSWER. WE HAVE GOT A LOT OF PEOPLE WORKING ON IT. WE HAVE AMBASSADOR CLUVERIUS IN THE REGION. THE SECRETARY HAS BEEN THERE THREE TIMES NOW, AND WE HAVE A VERY CAPABLE SET OF AMBASSADORS.

I DON'T THINK ANYONE WHO HAS LOOKED AT THIS SERIOUSLY REALLY FINDS THAT THAT IS AT ALL THE PROBLEM IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE.

Q: HAS HE FOUND AN OPENING ON HIS SCHEDULE THAT HE SAID IF HE COULD FIND HE WOULD GO BACK AND SEE WHAT HE COULD DO?

A: I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING NEW ON THAT.

Q: ON PAKISTAN, HAS THE US CONCLUDED THAT THE EXPLOSION AT THE WEAPONS DEPOT LAST MONTH WAS INDEED AN ACCIDENT AND NOT SABOTAGE?

A: I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING TO OFFER ON THAT.

C: THANK YOU. SHULTZ

ET

#7118